

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR
EUROPEAN MIGRATION
AND
FIELD INSPECTIONS OF OPERATIONS UNDER
P.L. 86-648 (FAIR SHARE REFUGEE ACT)

REPORT

OF

THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
TRANSMITTING A REPORT OF A
SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE

PURSUANT TO

H. Res. 36

EIGHTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS
A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE
ON THE JUDICIARY TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND
INVESTIGATIONS RELATING TO CERTAIN MAT-
TERS WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION

AND

H. Res. 510

EIGHTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS
A RESOLUTION TO GRANT ADDITIONAL TRAVEL AUTHORITY
TO THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY



DECEMBER 12, 1963.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House
on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

99-006

WASHINGTON : 1963

CONTENTS

PART I

	Page
Introduction.....	1
October 1963 sessions.....	2
Highlights of ICEM Council session.....	4
Operational program.....	4
Budget requirements.....	5
European program.....	6
Explanation of budget sections.....	6
Section I. Transport of national migrants.....	6
Section II. Previsa services.....	6
Section III. Development activities and technical cooperation.....	6
Section IV. Voluntary agencies.....	8
Section V. Refugees from Europe.....	9
Non-European Refugees Movements.....	10
Central issue of October 1963 ICEM sessions.....	12
Memorial to Hon. Francis E. Walter.....	14

PART II

Report on field inspection visits.....	14
--	----

APPENDIX

Remarks of Hon. Michael A. Feighan before ICEM Council.....	20
Index of financial tables.....	23
Per capita costs for transportation.....	23
ICEM grants to voluntary agencies.....	24
USEP grants to voluntary agencies.....	24
Composite of governmental and intergovernmental grants to voluntary agencies.....	25

III

88TH CONGRESS 1st Session	}	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES	}	REPORT No. 1034
------------------------------	---	--------------------------	---	--------------------

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR EUROPEAN MIGRATION
AND FIELD INSPECTIONS OF OPERATIONS UNDER PUBLIC LAW
86-648 (FAIR SHARE REFUGEE LAW)

DECEMBER 12, 1963.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the
State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. FEIGHAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted the
following

R E P O R T

[Pursuant to H. Res. 36 and H. Res. 510]

INTRODUCTION

The Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration was established for the purpose of encouraging cooperation among the nations of the free world in finding positive solutions to the problems of refugees and surplus populations in Europe. Refugee problems in the immediate postwar years were handled by the International Refugee Organization (IRO), an organ of the United Nations, with the cooperation of interested governments. The IRO was scheduled to be terminated in 1952, leaving a considerable refugee problem in Europe unresolved. At that time the economic recovery of liberated Europe was threatened by a surplus population problem and the continuing influx of new refugees escaping from the tyranny of Russian communism. While Russian efforts to seal off their extended empire from the free world made escape more difficult with each passing year, the Iron Curtain schematics were then not as complete as we find them today. Consequently the volume of escapees compounded the already serious problem of surplus populations in free Europe.

Under these circumstances the U.S. Government took the initiative to enlist the cooperation of governments of the free world in a program of collective action to meet this dual threat to European economic recovery. Guided by the experience with IRO operations, it was determined that participation in the proposed program of collective action should be restricted to governments of the free world.

Hence, an intergovernmental organization outside the structure of the United Nations was called for.

A preparatory meeting of interested governments met at Brussels, Belgium, during November-December 1951, with the Belgian Government acting as host. Attending that meeting were countries in need of emigration programs, countries interested in receiving immigrants and third-party countries evidencing a willingness to share in the responsibilities for a program of collective action. The Brussels Conference led to the establishment of a Provisional Intergovernmental Committee for the Movement of Migrants from Europe. This Provisional Committee acted ad interim until November 30, 1954, by which time 16 member governments had indicated acceptance of a constitution which in turn formally established the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration.

In the intervening 12 years, from the Brussels Conference to the present, membership on the Committee has increased to 29 governments; over 1,250,000 European migrants have been moved to settlement opportunities in the free world community, a series of new refugee crises have been met successfully, the problems of overpopulation in Europe have to a large extent been mitigated, and the fundamental values of intergovernmental cooperation in the field of migration have been demonstrated. U.S. initiative in launching this effort in collective action among the nations of the free world community and our generous financial support to it over the past years can be justified on the basis of the record of results obtained.

PART 1

THE 1963 SESSIONS OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR EUROPEAN MIGRATION

The semiannual sessions of ICEM's governing bodies took place from October 8 through 18, 1963, at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Executive Committee comprised of nine member nations, including the United States, was in session from October 8 through 10, 1963.

The Council comprised of 29 member nations was in session from October 14 through 18, 1963.

From the inception of this intergovernmental action, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality of the House Judiciary Committee, our late departed colleague, Francis E. Walter, played an active role in its deliberations, policy formulation, and oversight of its operations. From time to time other members of the subcommittee were invited by the late chairman to take part in this work. A practical recognition of the close relationship of the work of ICEM to that of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality requires that this congressional responsibility be maintained and strengthened. In dispatch of that responsibility members of the House Judiciary Committee comprised the congressional delegation attending various sessions of the Executive Committee and the Council pursuant to House Resolution 36 and House Resolution 510,

both of the 88th Congress, approved January 31, 1963, and September 26, 1963, respectively.¹

These members were Hon. Michael A. Feighan (Ohio), chairman; Hon. Frank Chelf (Kentucky); Hon. Peter W. Rodino, Jr. (New Jersey); Hon. Arch A. Moore, Jr. (West Virginia); and Hon. Clark MacGregor (Minnesota).

¹ H. Res. 36 and H. Res. 510 are as follows:

[H. Res. 36, 88th Cong., 1st session]

RESOLUTION

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1963, the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete investigations and studies relating to the following matters coming within the jurisdiction of the committee, namely—

- (1) relating to the administration and operation of general immigration and nationality laws and the resettlement of refugees, including such activities of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration which affect immigration in the United States; or involving violation of the immigration laws of the United States through abuse of private relief legislation;
- (2) involving claims, both public and private, against the United States;
- (3) involving the operation and administration of national penal institutions, including personnel and inmates therein;
- (4) relating to judicial proceedings and the administration of Federal courts and personnel thereof, including local courts in territories and possessions;
- (5) relating to the operation and administration of the antitrust laws, including the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, and the Federal Trade Commission Act; and
- (6) involving the operation and administration of Federal statutes, rules and regulations relating to crime and criminal procedure; and
- (7) involving the operation and administration of the Submerged Lands Acts and the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act.

Provided, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

The committee shall report to the House (or the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings and to require by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpoenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and notwithstanding section 1764 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the committee for expenses of its members or other Members or employees traveling abroad.

[H. Res. 510, 88th Cong., 1st sess.]

RESOLUTION

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the provisions of H. Res. 36, Eighty-eighth Congress, the Committee on the Judiciary is hereby authorized to send six of its members and two of its employees to (1) Geneva, Switzerland, to attend the twenty-third session of the Executive Committee and the twentieth session of the Council of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration; (2) Frankfurt, Germany; Rome, Italy; and Athens, Greece, to investigate and study the administrative operations conducted pursuant to Public Law 86-648 (the so-called Refugee Fair Share Act) and other administrative operations conducted by the several European offices of the Immigration and Naturalization Service pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act. Participation by members and staff assistants in such meetings, studies, and investigations, as herein authorized may occur jointly or by specially designated subcommittees; and the duration of the trip commencing on October 1, 1963, shall not exceed thirty days.

Notwithstanding section 1764 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provisions of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the committee and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, (1) That no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies or appropriated funds for subsistence in an amount in excess of the maximum per diem rates approved for overseas travel as set forth in the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as revised and amended by the Bureau of the Budget, or for payment of actual, reasonable transportation costs, actual food and lodging expenses; (2) that no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated fund shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

Each member or employee of the committee expending such foreign currencies shall report to the chairman of the committee the amounts and dollar equivalent value of each such foreign currency expended for actual transportation costs, for actual food and lodging expenses, and for per diem allowances and such report shall include proper documentation for each such expenditure, and by dates the length of time spent in each foreign country. For the purpose of this report the statement of a per diem allowance shall be considered a sufficient itemization of any expenditures made from such allowance. If transportation was furnished by a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States the cost of such transportation shall be included in such report at the value assigned it by such department, agency, or instrumentality. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE ICEM COUNCIL SESSIONS

OPERATIONAL PROGRAM

Under this heading consideration was given to the volume of migrants to be transported from Europe and settled in 10 major receiving countries of the free world during calendar year 1963 and calendar year 1964. For 1963 the volume was estimated at 64,700 individuals, comprised of 33,200 national migrants and 31,500 refugees. The record of actual migrant movements up to September 1963 indicated this estimate would be realized by the end of the current calendar year. After consultations among the countries of emigration and the countries of immigration an estimate was reached on the number of European migrants to be transported during 1964. That estimate was 69,200 individuals, comprised of 37,300 national migrants and 31,900 refugees.

It is worth noting in this connection that the actual movement of migrants from Europe during calendar year 1962 totaled 67,887 individuals. This figure included 40,193 national migrants and 27,694 refugees. From this it is evident that ICEM migration movements from Europe during the current calendar year will be approximately 3,000 less than last year and that the estimate for 1964 reflects an expected increase of some 1,300 individuals over the 1962 record. Furthermore, the movement of refugees during the current year reflects an increase of 3,806 individuals over 1962 movements while the movement of national migrants fell off by 7,000 during the same period.

Fluctuations in the number of migrants transported from Europe for settlement in countries of the free world are to be expected because of the nature of the program. While refugee movements have demonstrated an increase, it is possible this trend could be reversed or even further increased. Developments behind the Iron Curtain and opportunities for individuals to escape or otherwise find their way into free Europe causes this uncertainty in the volume of refugee movements. The volume of national migrants depends largely upon the development of settlement plans in the receiving countries and economic conditions in the countries of Europe from which the migrants are moved. Here the volume of movements can be increased by training nationals in the surplus population countries in the skills needed by the receiving countries for programs geared to their economic development. The opportunities for such selective programs in the developing countries of Latin America offer great promise for the future.

In addition to the movement of national migrants and refugees from Europe, ICEM has been involved in the movement of refugees in the Far East. This involved the movement of so-called White Russians from Harbin, China, through Hong Kong to various countries of the free world, principally Australia and Latin America. The volume of these movements for the current year is expected to be 1,300 individuals as against 1,849 individuals moved during 1962. It is estimated 1,300 so-called White Russians living in Red China will be moved through Hong Kong to the receiving countries during 1964.

BUDGET REQUIREMENTS

A considerable amount of time was devoted during sessions of the Executive Committee and the Council to budgetary requirements to complete the current year of operations and projections of budget needs for 1964.

The original budget estimate for the current year was \$21,533,795. A revised budget of \$20,738,915 was presented for consideration during the Council session. This reflected a budget decrease of \$794,880, made necessary by the fact that actual migrant movements will fall short of the estimate made for the current year. Cuts of \$747,880 were made in the operations budget and \$47,000 in the administrative overhead. Considering funds on hand, funds receivable, and additional pledges of funds by member governments, a deficit of \$591,124 still remained to be covered when the Council met on October 14, 1963.

It is worth noting in the context of this budget deficit that ICEM administration began current year operations with a surplus carryover of funds from 1962 in the amount of \$993,129. This surplus accrued despite the fact ICEM moved approximately 3,700 more migrants during 1962 than are expected to be moved during the current year. Moreover, actual expenditures for 1962 were \$21,034,510 as compared to the revised estimate of \$20,738,915 for 1963. This reflects a net rise in cost of operations in the amount of \$697,584 in the course of 1 year despite the appreciable fall off of migrant movements during the same period.

New grants and additional pledges of funds by member governments during the course of the Council sessions reduced the deficit of \$591,124 to approximately \$100,000.

The budget estimate for 1964, based upon the projected requirement to move 69,200 European migrants and 1,300 so-called White Russians in the Far East, was \$21,657,280. This figure compares favorably with the volume and cost of operations in 1962 and can result in an improvement over 1963 operations if the estimated number of people to be moved are actually moved with no additional costs to the member governments. The actual per capita cost to move migrants in 1962 was \$314. The revised plan for 1963 indicates a per capita cost of \$314 and the estimated per capita cost for 1964 is \$293.

There was discussion on the advisability of reducing the cost of administrative overhead when the volume of migrant movements decreased appreciably. The Director of ICEM maintained it was difficult to cut personnel below a certain level and at the same time provide efficient operations. He further maintained economies which he had made during 1963 and planned for 1964 would be offset in some degree by the rising rental costs for headquarters offices, normal salary increments, and cost-of-living increases for the staff. While note was taken of the economies effected during the past 2 years, this will be a matter of continuing interest to many member governments, particularly the United States.

The following table provides a comparative brief of actual expenditures in 1962, estimated expenditures for 1963, and proposed expenditures for 1964:

	1964 proposed	1963 estimates	1962 actual
Operational:			
European program.....	\$18,778,280	\$17,633,035	\$17,436,120
Far East and miscellaneous movements programs.....	589,700	632,200	773,990
Total.....	19,367,980	18,265,235	18,210,110
Administrative.....	2,289,300	2,474,000	2,824,400
Total.....	21,657,280	20,739,235	21,034,510

EUROPEAN PROGRAM

The budget breakdown of costs for European migration programs is reflected in the following table which compares actual costs for 1962 with estimated costs for 1963 and proposed costs for 1964:

	1964 proposed	1963 estimates	1962 actual
Sec. I. Transport of national migrants.....	\$8,190,045	\$7,057,300	\$7,688,720
Sec. II. Previsa services.....	748,340	717,640	616,690
Sec. III. Development activities and technical cooperation.....	1,319,900	1,321,800	1,029,750
Sec. IV. Voluntary agencies.....	2,234,160	2,394,040	2,481,175
Sec. V. Refugees from Europe.....	6,185,835	6,142,255	5,669,785
Total.....	18,778,280	17,633,035	17,436,120

EXPLANATION OF BUDGET SECTIONS

Section I covers the costs of transporting national migrants from Europe to 10 major countries of settlement. The national migrants are moved from countries with a surplus population under arrangements made between the governments of the receiving countries and the governments of the national migrants. Voluntary agencies participate in this phase of the program by providing special services in the reuniting of families, placement of hardship cases, and support of special settlement projects. ICEM provides the sea or air transportation as necessary on a cost schedule considerably lower than normal commercial costs for such transportation. A table of per capita costs for such transportation will be found in the appendix of this report.

Section II covers the costs of previsa services for national migrants. These services offered by ICEM vary according to the needs of each emigration country. Generally, they are described as informational, counseling, assistance in registration and preparation of documents, preselection, and selection activities. In summary, these services are intended to assist persons who desire to emigrate in fulfilling their hopes in a manner consistent with the criteria and needs of the receiving countries and under conditions that will contribute to their successful settlement.

Section III covers a wide range of necessary and desirable services as well as some questionable activities involving an appreciable outlay of intergovernmental funds. Among the necessary and desirable services are the following:

(a) Assistance to countries of immigration in the development of a modern and efficient national immigration service. This has particular application to the developing countries of Latin America.

(b) Development of language and vocational training facilities in the countries of emigration. Language training is necessary for national migrants before they leave their homelands in order to assure rapid and successful adaptation to conditions in the countries of settlement. Vocational training of migrants is necessary to meet the selective requirements of receiving countries for skilled and semi-skilled immigrants. The demand for selective immigration programs has replaced haphazard, hit-or-miss immigration schemes of the past. More and more countries of immigration are insisting that immigrants applying for admission possess the skills and semiskills needed for the economic development of their country. This trend is natural since the countries offering the greatest potential for immigration are the developing countries and the longrun values of selective type immigration programs are becoming quite evident. ICEM has made a commendable start on meeting the needs of this trend but has only scratched the surface of the potential possibilities.

(c) The stimulation and planning of group agricultural settlement projects in the developing countries of the free world community. A number of such projects have been undertaken successfully while some have failed. Involved are the twin problems of food production and food marketing. The resolution of these problems calls for skilled and experienced workers in the art of food production, carefully thought out plans for land utilization, involvement of idle, wasted, and unskilled manpower in the receiving countries, and the enthusiastic cooperation by governments of the receiving countries in organizing the marketing of food production to meet the needs of their people. Most of Latin America presents a classic example of both the need and the potential for good of such programs. Many of the countries in Latin America are food deficit countries despite the fact they have vast areas of productive land awaiting development and cultivation. Moreover, those same countries have reservoirs of idle and unskilled manpower, the campesinos, pleading for an opportunity to participate in and to share in the progress made by Western civilization. The urgency for ICEM to launch a full-scale effort in this direction is underscored by these facts: (1) Many Latin American countries now dissipate their foreign exchange credits for the import of food needed to sustain their people; (2) such foreign exchange credits should be restricted to acquiring the means necessary for their longrun economic development; (3) large segments of population in Latin America are existing on substandard diets and confined to modes of living that betray the minimum standards of Western life; (4) U.S. contributions of surplus foods to these countries, while serving an emergency need, cannot be continued indefinitely; and (5) present global food requirements preclude the waste of vast areas of land resources suited to the production of marketable crops.

This natural potential of the Latin American countries, corresponding as it does to the present and future needs of the free world, must not be neglected. ICEM cannot be expected to carry this burden of opportunity alone. Participation of both private and public investment in mixed-group land development projects in Latin America, as described above, must be a priority objective of the member nations in the immediate years ahead.

Among the questionable activities carried on by ICEM, requiring a substantial financial outlay of intergovernmental funds, the following are involved: (1) Retaining a private organization, described as non-profit and headquartered in Washington, D.C.; (2) retaining a legal firm likewise located in Washington, D.C.; and (3) retaining a public relations firm located in New York City.

The private organization, known as International Development Services, Inc., is retained at an annual cost of \$120,000. Examination of the budget indicates ICEM has made adequate staff provisions for the kind of professional services described as contracted for with this private group.

The law firm of Landis, Cohen & Singman has been engaged since 1962 for a basic retainer of \$7,800 per annum, \$200 per month additional for office and general expenses, travel allowances while on business for the Committee, and additional compensation to be mutually agreed upon for special studies or services undertaken at the Director's request. The predecessor law firm, Landis, Cohen, Rubin & Schwartz, enjoyed a similar contractual relationship with ICEM. So far as could be learned the additional compensation, resulting from agreements with the present Director, was \$5,000 in 1961 and \$5,000 in 1962. Accordingly, ICEM paid the law firm of Landis, Cohen, Rubin & Schwartz a sum of \$15,200, plus expenses, for 1961 and the firm of Landis, Cohen & Singman a sum of \$15,200, plus expenses, for 1962. Mr. Abba P. Schwartz resigned from the law firm of Landis, Cohen, Rubin & Schwartz on September 1, 1962, to accept the post of Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, Department of State. According to information provided by the Director of ICEM, Mr. Schwartz has been under contract since December 7, 1951, and it would appear predecessor law firms in which Mr. Schwartz was a partner were paid well in excess of \$100,000, plus expenses, over a 10-year period. It is not clear why an international organization, particularly one of ICEM's character, should be required to engage the services of a law firm in the United States. Professional personnel employed full time by ICEM should be able to provide the legal requirements of the Committee. If they are not, steps should be taken to secure adequate legal counsel on a full-time basis.

The public relations firm, Vernon Pope Co., of New York City, is retained by ICEM on a contract of \$13,000 per annum. This contract was described as one involving a public information consultant rather than a public relations firm. It is worth noting that the vice president of this firm, who is now engaged with ICEM matters, was formerly Chief of Public Information for ICEM. No details on the services performed by Vernon Pope Co. were made available in response to the inquiry made by the congressional delegation.

Further inquiry will be made into the details of these contracts in an effort to secure the background facts and to identify what actual services were performed under the contracts.

Section IV covers ICEM grants to cooperating voluntary agencies for their work with national migrants. The funds provided under this section are broken down into three subdivisions: transport costs, postvisa services, and direct financial assistance to the voluntary agencies. For example, the proposed \$2,334,610 for 1964 will allocate \$1,568,000 for transport costs, \$58,110 for postvisa services, and \$708,050 for direct financial assistance to the voluntary agencies.

This system has been in effect for some years, permitting each voluntary agency to establish and build up what is known as a revolving fund. The voluntary agency undertakes to advance transportation funds to migrants who lack the funds to pay for their transportation costs. In turn the migrant signs a promissory note to repay the voluntary agency. All repayments on such promissory notes are deposited in the agency revolving fund. Collections on such promissory notes have been averaging about 60 percent, which is considered a fair return in light of the nature of the work and the human problems involved. To offset possible losses, ICEM has established a grant in fund scale of \$35 per capita for persons moved to North America and \$105 for persons moved to other areas, such as Latin America and Australia. In addition, ICEM provides a per capita grant of \$25 for each migrant moved, which is considered a contribution to the administrative overhead costs of the voluntary agency concerned.

In addition to these contributions, ICEM makes reception and placement grants to the voluntary agencies to enable them to maintain their services and to stimulate sound sponsorships for additional migrants in the receiving countries.

A breakdown of ICEM grants to voluntary agencies for 1962 will be found in the appendix of this report. Complete information on grants made during the current year will not be available until the first quarter of 1964.

Section V covers the costs of moving refugees from Europe and resettling them in the receiving countries. European refugee camps, not so many years ago a serious problem, have been liquidated by the processes of immigration and local absorption of the refugees. All that remains in 1963 are refugee centers for the reception and emergency care of new arrivals, pending completion of arrangements for their resettlement. A major objective of ICEM is to prevent a return of the refugee camps by maintaining a steady and planned flow of refugees to countries of permanent settlement.

The U.S. escapee program provides funds to voluntary agencies for the care of refugees pending completion of resettlement plans for them. Out-of-camp arrangements for such emergency care are made in the countries of first asylum. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany maintains one major non-German refugee center, located on the outskirts of Nuremberg. Departures from the center each month run at about the same rate as new arrivals. In some European countries the arrival of new refugees is now at a higher rate than in recent years. However, the total volume of new arrivals remains within manageable proportions considering the plans and facilities of the voluntary agencies and the rate of resettlement opportunities provided by the receiving countries.

ICEM financial arrangements with the voluntary agencies for refugee movements follows about the same pattern described above for national migrants. The revolving fund principles are maintained, but the previsa and postvisa services for refugees are carried out in the main by the voluntary agencies. However, it is expected that grants to the revolving funds of the voluntary agencies will be reduced during 1964, due to the accumulation of capital funds as a consequence of the repayment rates on the immigrant promissory notes. A review of the status of all such voluntary agency revolving funds is to be undertaken in the immediate future.

In addition to the above financial arrangements for refugees there is the U.S. transportation loan fund. This fund was established by the U.S. escapee program. Refugees who qualify under standards established by the U.S. Government may apply for a loan to cover the transportation costs of their resettlement. Such applications are made through one of the voluntary agencies and for all loans granted the refugee must sign a promissory note of repayment to the U.S. Government. All repayments are returned to the loan fund, which in effect is a revolving fund. As of December 31, 1962, a total of \$166,000 was available in the loan fund. As of that same date it was estimated that \$519,994.80 of the total outstanding funds would be repaid. This estimate was based upon the repayment ratio established over the life of the fund.

A table of grants by the U.S. escapee program to voluntary agencies for 1962 to cover the emergency care of refugees in Europe will be found in the appendix of this report.

NON-EUROPEAN REFUGEE MOVEMENTS

While ICEM was established for the stated purpose of resolving the problems of refugees and surplus populations in Europe, it has become involved in refugee movements outside Europe. The constitution adopted by the member governments as well as the language of the resolution leading to the adoption of the constitution restricts the mission of ICEM to programs of migration from Europe to countries of the free world. When the International Refugee Organization was being liquidated, a trust fund was established to receive assets of the Organization after its liquidation was completed. It now appears those assets were earmarked in such a manner as to restrict their use to refugees outside the constitutional mandate of ICEM or at least to make their use subject to decisions by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. Whatever the purpose may have been in restricting or earmarking the IRO trust funds, the fact remains that they were used as early as 1952 in an effort to divert ICEM from its constitutional course of promoting migration from the countries of Europe.

Resolution No. 33, adopted at the ICEM sessions in October of 1952, authorized the Director to employ its technical facilities for the movement of European refugees from areas outside Europe, providing, however, that none of the ICEM funds for migration movements from Europe would be used. This meant that only IRO trust funds could be used for activities outside the constitutional competence of ICEM. One year later, at the October 1953 sessions of ICEM, Resolution No. 61 was adopted, authorizing the Director to continue this involvement in non-European refugee movements "until the resources available through the present IRO trust fund are exhausted." This resolution also carried an appeal for special contributions from member governments for funds to resettle "groups of refugees of European origin resident outside Europe * * *." From this it would also appear that a studied effort has been made from the outset of ICEM to divert it from its basic purpose of relieving population pressures in Europe.

The major consequences of these resolutions to date has been the involvement of ICEM in the movement of so-called White Russians from Red China through Hong Kong to countries of the free world.

According to the Director's report on policy and progress, given at Geneva during the October 1963 sessions, a total of 19,493 so-called White Russians have been moved out of Red China through Hong Kong to countries of the free world. None of these people are refugees in the proper sense of the term. The vast majority settled in the area of Harbin, China, following the collapse of the Russian Tsarist empire in 1917-18. They were refugees in the wake of World War I, but they elected to resettle in China. The fact that security investigation of these people was impossible while they resided in Red China compounds the risk of ICEM involvement in this scheme.

It is worth noting in this regard that, according to Price Waterhouse & Co. audited reports of 1962 ICEM operations, voluntary agencies held promissory notes in the amount of \$2,122,000 for the movement of the so-called White Russians from Red China to countries of the free world. The auditors report makes this additional significant observation: "Because collections against these promissory notes are slow and uncertain, they are only taken up as income in the year of receipt." The auditors report also took note of the fact that "three voluntary agencies held migrant's promissory notes under the U.S. Refugee Relief Act of 1953 special program amounting to \$167,000; collections on these notes are payable to the U.S. Department of State."

The only comparable, unfavorable accounting of funds found in the Price Waterhouse & Co. audited report for 1962 appears in the section devoted to the IRO trust fund, managed by ICEM. That report reflects the fact that unpaid migrant promissory notes signed prior to January 1, 1957, were in the amount of \$1,067,000. In other words these unpaid, outstanding promissory notes in default extended back for 6 years. Since IRO trust funds could not be used for the movement of European refugees from Europe it can be safely assumed these funds were used exclusively for the movement of so-called White Russians from Red China to countries of the free world. ICEM does not report the movement of any other group of refugees of European origin outside Europe so it must be assumed this additional failure to repay on promissory notes applies exclusively to the so-called White Russians. Accordingly, ICEM involvement with the so-called White Russian refugees has produced a net loss of \$3,189,000.

Price Waterhouse & Co. audited report also reveals that the IRO trust fund was bankrupt as of December 31, 1962. Arrangements should be made by the ICEM Director for the productive use of any funds receivable through this bookkeeping account that might result from repayments on promissory notes signed by the so-called White Russians. Revenues from this source will be small since total income for 1962 from this source was reported as \$20,638.

The proposed ICEM budget for 1964 carries a sum of \$589,700 for a continuation of this involvement with so-called White Russians residing in Red China. During a session of the Executive Committee, a question was raised by one of the member governments as to what solid information was available about the people to be moved under this section of the budget. A revealing statement came from the Comptroller of ICEM who was responding to questions raised on the proposed budget for 1964. He stated "we are in the dark" about this matter. A request was then made for a background paper on this proposed movement of people from Red China. This request

had not been met as of the closing of the Council sessions on October 18, 1963.

Informal inquiry revealed that an estimated 1,300 so-called White Russians were believed to be residing in Sinkiang Province, the Three Rivers area, and in Shanghai. It appeared this estimate was based upon hearsay and rumors picked up in and about Hong Kong. No one seemed to know how these people were going to depart Red China or who would stimulate their movement into Hong Kong or other areas of free Asia.

During a meeting of the congressional delegation with Mr. Abba P. Schwartz, Mr. George L. Warren, Sr., and others connected with the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs of the Department of State, in Geneva on October 15, 1963, a number of questions were raised about ICEM involvement in the Far East. It was pointed out that this involvement was clearly outside the constitutional limitation of European migration movements, that the 1964 budget estimate of \$589,700 for this involvement was in poor taste in light of the current shortage of funds and that this entire matter of digging up World War I refugees in Red China created the valid impression ICEM had run out of migration work to be done in Europe.

Defense of this ICEM involvement by the representatives of the Department of State held that assets of the IRO trust fund plus earmarked contributions of interested governments accounted for the original and continuing involvement of ICEM. If this is in fact the case, there should now be no difficulty in extracting ICEM from this involvement. The IRO trust fund is bankrupt and repayments into it in the future are likely to be no more than marginal. ICEM should, however, place a first call demand against such repayments until the promissory notes are repaid, amounting to \$3,189,000. Such member governments as wish to continue their participation in the movement of the so-called White Russians from Red China can do so outside the operating structure of ICEM, a practice now engaged in by some member governments in regard to the movement of certain national migrants.

Extraction of ICEM from this Far East movements program would be a long step in the direction of pulling its activities back within the limits of its constitutional mandate. So long as this glaring exception remains, the temptation will be great to divert the work into other unrelated activities.

CENTRAL ISSUE OF OCTOBER 1963 ICEM SESSIONS

There was one central and overriding issue during the session of the Executive Committee and the Council. That issue was the future role of ICEM.

During sessions of the Executive Committee, the Director of ICEM stressed the need for the Committee to justify its continuing existence. He pointed up the slowdown in migration movements during the past several years, comparing this trend with the annual average of 118,000 migrants moved during the first 10 years of operation. The question was raised whether ICEM should make its established facilities and technical assistance services available for population problems and refugees outside of Europe. While no specific areas of new operations were spelled out, it was generally accepted

this reference applied to population upsets and refugees in Africa, the Middle East, and in Hong Kong.

The member governments on the whole did not respond favorably to this query. Several delegations sought specific proposals from the Director which could be openly examined as examples of the "new business" proposals. One delegation proposed that a special committee be appointed to evaluate the new business proposals with the Director and to report back to the Council at its next meeting. An alternative proposal called for the Director to spell out his proposals in a report to be circulated among the member governments for their study and evaluation.

A spokesman for the International Council of Voluntary Agencies appeared before the ICEM Council and gave enthusiastic endorsement to the Director's proposal to broaden the scope of ICEM operations. This point was stressed by quoting from a prior resolution adopted by the voluntary agencies, as follows:

In today's world, with its increase in refugee and migrant problems, consideration should be given to broadening its scope of activities, in order that its competence, experience, and efficiency be extended to help with resettlement programs new in its sphere of activities.

At a later point, quotation was made from another resolution adopted by the voluntary agencies calling for comparable intergovernmental funds and services for Asian and African refugees "as currently provided through ICEM for European refugees."

The U.S. delegate to the Executive Committee, Mr. George L. Warren, Sr., offered an analysis of the implications in the Director's proposal, mainly, that ICEM was governed by a constitution which purposely fixed limits on the scope of its operations and activities, that a need existed within ICEM for clear policy lines and that such policy should be reflected in resolutions duly adopted by the Council, that ICEM was intended as an international instrument to move national migrants and refugees from Europe who could not move under their own "steam," and that much remained to be done in assisting member governments in improving their national programs for both emigration and immigration.

Representative Michael A. Feighan addressed the Council and underscored the need for ICEM to concentrate on its unfinished business of moving national migrants and refugees from Europe to the widest possible range of resettlement opportunities in the free world community, particularly the developing countries of Latin America. He pointed out there was no present need to justify the continuation of ICEM, because of the volume of unfinished business and the need to concentrate on selective immigration programs to meet the needs of the receiving countries for skilled and semiskilled migrants. After a brief description of the need for well-thought-out, mixed-group land settlement and development programs in Latin America, he challenged the member delegations to harness their resources, experience, and technical assistance to the task of helping the developing nations of that area to realize their natural potential.

The text of his remarks before the Council is contained in the appendix of this report.

The central issue before both the Executive Committee and the Council was resolved to the extent that the Director was not granted any new authority and was cautioned against activities within the limits of the governing constitution that would tend to divert ICEM from its real mission. It is evident that ways and means must be found to tighten up the administration of ICEM and to provide clear policy directives on priorities of migration programs and activities before the next session of the Council.

If the problems of refugees and population upsets in other regions of the world reach a magnitude calling for intergovernmental action, regional action committees should be established by the governments concerned. ICEM was established to resolve a European regional problem and that mission is far from complete. Moreover, the changing emphasis to selective immigration and the urgent need to launch a full-scale effort in mixed-group land development projects in Latin America is more than sufficient to tax the resources and capabilities of ICEM. All too frequently efforts are made to broaden the scope of intergovernmental enterprises before they have accomplished their intended mission. Such diversionary efforts can only weaken and endanger the future of otherwise sound undertakings.

MEMORIAL TO THE LATE HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

A morning session of the Council was set aside on October 16, 1963, to honor the memory of our late colleague Francis E. Walter who played a leading role for many years in the work of ICEM. A migrant processing center in Greece was dedicated to his name. Delegations of many member governments paid tribute to the role he played in the work of the Council. Hon. Peter W. Rodino, Jr., spoke on behalf of the congressional delegation and read a message expressing the personal views of Hon. Emanuel Celler, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee. A verbatim text of the memorial service will be forwarded to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the family of our late colleague.

PART 2

INSPECTIONS OF FIELD OPERATIONS UNDER PUBLIC LAW 86-648

The special mission entrusted to a subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary by the House, pursuant to House Resolution 510, had two objectives:

(1) Field investigation of administrative operations involving the entry of European refugees to the United States under Public Law 86-648; and

(2) Participation in the 22d session of the Executive Committee and the 20th session of the Council of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration.

The significance of the first objective of the mission lies in the fact that Public Law 86-648 under which the United States admits its statutorily determined "fair share" of refugees authorizes entry of qualified refugees in "parole" status outside of the immigration quotas and regular immigration visa procedures, and is administered by the officers of the Immigration and Naturalization Service stationed in Europe.

Originally, the law was enacted in 1960 as a contribution of the United States to the World Refugee Year, and was primarily designed to contribute to the closing of the last refugee camps in Europe. It was to remain in effect for 2 years. In view of the diminished but nevertheless continuing influx of refugees from Eastern Europe and certain parts of the Near East, the law was extended indefinitely in 1962, pursuant to section 6 of Public Law 87-510. It is, however, subject to being abrogated by a resolution passed either by the House of Representatives or the Senate. Under the law, the United States may admit up to 25 percent of the total number of refugees admitted by other countries of the free world. This is the formula, which is commonly expressed by the notion of "fair share."

The fact that the Congress has made it possible for either of its two Houses to terminate the paroling of refugees at any time makes it imperative that a close and continuous supervision and scrutiny of administrative operations, the screening, the selection, and the movement of refugees to the United States, be maintained.

Accordingly, the subcommittee designated under House Resolution 510, *supra*, proceeded, in groups, to the principal places in Europe where refugees are being screened and interviewed for the purpose of determining their eligibility to enter the United States and their qualifications, as well as the desirability of their entry.

REPORT OF FIELD INSPECTION IN GREECE

On its first stop, October 8 to 11, 1963, two members of the subcommittee, Messrs. Arch A. Moore, Jr., and Clark MacGregor, visited the refugee camp at Lavrion, located approximately 35 miles from Athens, where at the present time approximately 80 refugees, who recently escaped from Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Albania, and Rumania, are housed. Extensive interviews with individual refugees were conducted by the two members of the special subcommittee, for the purpose of obtaining information regarding conditions existing in their native countries, circumstances and methods of their escape, their apprehension by the Greek border guards, and their admission to the camp administered jointly by various voluntary service organizations, the Greek Government, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, and ICEM.

During the visits at Lavrion and Athens, Messrs. Moore and MacGregor reviewed the screening procedures applied by the Immigration and Naturalization Service and actively participated, with officers of the Service, in the questioning of the refugees during personal interviews conducted for the purpose of establishing their eligibility for paroling into the United States under Public Law 86-648.

Full review of regulations under which the law is administered, as well as the perusal of individual applications and files, followed the interviews.

While in Athens, Messrs. Moore and MacGregor visited three vocational schools maintained in the vicinity of Athens by ICEM. The schools, financed jointly by ICEM and the Governments of Greece, Australia, and New Zealand, specialize in vocational training of Greek emigrants, male and female, selected for emigration to Australia and New Zealand. Several phases of technical training are given the male candidates for emigration, the courses lasting from 4

to 8 months. Female candidates for emigration, unmarried girls, aged 18 to 25, receive training in housekeeping, hotel, and hospital service, while both sexes also attend courses in the English language.

Also in Athens, Messrs. Moore and MacGregor inspected the site and examined the architectural plans for the erection of an internationally financed Greek immigrants vocational training and processing center. At the initiative of the Greek Government, the processing center, scheduled to be completed in the spring of 1965, will be named in memory of Francis E. Walter, the longtime chairman of the House Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality, who was most instrumental in the creation of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration. At the meeting of ICEM's Council in Geneva, the unanimously adopted resolution expressed the Council's "warm and unanimous welcome" of the Greek Government's decision to name the processing center in the memory of Francis E. Walter.

REPORT OF FIELD INSPECTION IN ITALY

On the next stop, October 11 to 13, 1963, at Rome, Italy, Messrs. Moore and MacGregor examined the administrative operations conducted pursuant to the Refugee Fair Share Act, Public Law 86-648. Most of the refugees, applying in Italy for entry into the United States, come from Rumania, Yugoslavia, and Egypt. In the latter country, persecution based on religious rather than political ground serves to drive into exile a rather large number of refugees of the Christian and Jewish faiths. In contrast to Greece where the majority of refugees is composed of single young men who decided to try the escape from contiguous territory, braving armed guards, trenches, and barbed wire, the refugees seeking first asylum in Italy represent family units which often through devious means succeed in obtaining exit permits from the governments now ruling their respective countries.

In Rome, Messrs. Moore and MacGregor interrogated several married couples in their late thirties with and without children, registered for parole entry into the United States as refugees from Eastern Europe and conducted general inquiry along the lines of their study in Athens.

Messrs. Moore and MacGregor wish to express words of commendation for the officers of the Immigration and Naturalization Service stationed in Greece and in Italy for their dedication and the high quality of their work.

Immediately following the conclusion of the ICEM Council sessions, Chairman Michael A. Feighan undertook a field inspection of operations in Germany and France under Public Law 86-648. The findings of that inspection are summarized below.

REPORT OF FIELD INSPECTION IN GERMANY

On October 18, 1963, a visit was made to Camp Zirndorf, on the outskirts of Nuremberg, Germany. This is the only remaining refugee center maintained by the authorities of the Federal Republic of Germany for the care of non-German refugees and escapees. It has a

capacity of 750 individuals and serves as a temporary haven while resettlement arrangements are being made for the refugees-escapees. With the help of voluntary agencies, new arrivals are processed as rapidly as possible and placed in normal living arrangements in German cities and villages, pending completion of the resettlement plan. Some families, particularly those with a number of small children, may remain at Camp Zirndorf until plans for their resettlement are completed. During the month of September 1963, for example, there were 249 new arrivals in the camp and 271 refugees departed the camp. The total camp population as of September 1, 1963, was 506 and on September 30, 1963, it was 484. These figures reflect the constant flow of refugees in and out of Camp Zirndorf and the average monthly population of the camp.

Facilities provided for the refugees-escapees are modest but clean and well ordered. The kitchen was equipped with modern, mass cooking and food storage facilities. Mess facilities were arranged on a self-service cafeteria basis. Housing was provided in three large buildings with separate quarters maintained for single or unattached individuals. Families were quartered in a separate building, arranged into small apartments to provide privacy. Chapels were provided for the various faiths with chaplains in attendance. A small infirmary was in readiness for the care of the sick or injured among the refugees.

A new administration building has been opened recently which provides offices for the processing of the refugees. These offices are maintained for missions of the various countries providing a haven for refugees and for voluntary agencies cooperating with those missions.

Visits and discussions with the refugees-escapees from various countries behind the Iron Curtain revealed a strong spirit of resistance against the Communist regimes in control of their homelands. A young Hungarian couple with a small child related the rigors of life and the suppression of freedom in their homeland. Two young Croatian escapees, in their midtwenties, revealed current efforts of the Tito regime to stifle individual liberty and to intensify its organized suppression of Croatian national life. Two young escapees from Slovenia expressed similar sentiments. In all, the refugees-escapees in the camp during the visit came from 11 countries behind the Iron Curtain. In every room and living quarters visited, the display of religious pictures and objects provided adequate evidence, if such was needed, of one of the major reasons which move people to run the risks of escape from the tyranny of communism.

On October 19, 1963, a day long visit was made to free Berlin. The infamous wall has reduced escape to a trickle but there remains in Berlin a few hard core cases requiring attention. Examination of these cases revealed they do not qualify for admission into the United States because of health or physical handicap conditions of a member of the applicant's family. The American consul in Berlin, who has spent many years working with refugees, is to be commended for her concern over these hardship cases.

A visit was made to various key points along the wall of infamy which now divides Berlin. It was patently obvious this monstrous wall of hate was erected because of Russian fear of human freedom which is so vibrantly alive in free Berlin. But the wall, which appeared to be 8 to 10 feet thick in many places, also stands as a

symbol of Russian intent to spread fear and intimidation among the people of free Berlin. There can be no doubt the Russians intend to carry on their ruthless war of nerves behind the threatening specter of the wall. Nowhere along the thousands of miles of the Iron Curtain which divides Europe is its true meaning so vividly expressed as in Berlin. There the wall in all its warlike detail is exposed for civilized mankind to see and evaluate. That scene, portraying as it does the harsh reality of the cold war, puts the lie to any claims about a thaw in East-West relations.

On October 21, 1963, an inspection was made of the Northern European headquarters office of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service at Frankfurt, Germany. This headquarters office directs the work of seven immigration inspectors assigned to the field in Germany, Austria, and France. Basic records of refugees-escapees applying for paroled admission into the United States are maintained at this facility. These records contain all the basic information through which the inspectors make a preadmissibility examination and judgment on the individual applicant for admission.

By established procedure each applicant for admission is given one or more personal interviews by an immigration inspector. Prior to such interviews the record on the individual applicant is completed, including information from all concerned departments and agencies of the Government of the United States, reports from security agencies of cooperating governments, local police file check, and the results of other field security inquiries. The immigration inspector must satisfy himself on both the eligibility of the individual applicant as a refugee-escapee under the fair share refugee program and as well his admissibility into the United States under controlling provisions of the immigration and nationality laws.

Each applicant for admission into the United States is fingerprinted by the Service. These fingerprints are checked against extensive records maintained by the United States and with cooperating government resources. Standardized photographs of each applicant are also a part of the individual applicants record.

As a part of the inspection procedure conducted on October 21, 1963, a review was made of pending cases, selected at random. This procedure revealed in detail the various stages of inquiry involved in the individual case preparatory to interviews by the immigration inspectors. It was evident the Service is utilizing every reliable source of information available in the process of inquiry and that careful attention is given to necessary details as well as the control of individual case records.

The Northern European director of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and his staff of inspectors and aids are deserving of commendation for the quality of their work and their dedication to it.

REPORT OF FIELD INSPECTION IN FRANCE

October 22 and 23, 1963, were devoted to an inspection of the refugee-escapee processing facilities in Paris, France. This inspection entailed conferences with appropriate officials in the American Embassy and with immigration inspectors and extensive interviews with refugee-escapees.

Modest but adequate quarters are made available to the Immigration and Naturalization Service in a U.S. facility within walking distance from the American Embassy. These facilities are used for preliminary and final interviews with refugees-escapees. Appointments for interview are arranged by the Service. Records on the individual cases are maintained elsewhere and are moved to this facility in accordance with the interviews scheduled in advance.

While France is not a country of first asylum for refugees-escapees, it is worth noting that a total of 7,936 such individuals had registered with the Paris office of the Immigration and Naturalization Service as of September 30, 1963. This situation results mainly from the fact that France maintains a generous policy toward refugee-escapees who are seeking asylum in countries of the free world. Consequently, many take refuge in France with the intention of applying for admission into countries of the Western Hemisphere.

Of the total number registered with the Paris office, 2,825 were from Yugoslavia, 1,990 from the United Arab Republic, 1,100 from Rumania, 474 from Hungary, 457 from Poland, 111 from Albania, 124 from the U.S.S.R., and the balance scattered among eight other countries of origin.

Interviews were held with applicants from Rumania, Hungary, Yugoslavia, and the United Arab Republic. All those interviewed stated religious and political persecution as their reasons for escape or departure from their countries of origin. Similarly, all those interviewed gave as their reasons for seeking paroled admission into the United States the hope of providing their children with the opportunity to grow up in a society free of fear coercion and where a normal family life could be reestablished. Descriptions of everyday life behind the Iron Curtain developed in the course of these interviews confirmed a continuation of standard Communist practices and policies calculated to retain the dictatorship in power and to further the objectives of world communism. While tactics used to control the captive populations may have changed, the character of the instruments of power control have not. The built-in harassments and discriminations against all non-Communists are a normal part of life behind the Iron Curtain.

These interviews also provided information on the organization structure of a massive Communist blackmail operation at work in the free world. Persons in the free world with relatives living in certain countries behind the Iron Curtain are contacted and informed that for a price in hard currencies exit permits can be obtained for their relatives. The price tag on these exit permits varies according to ability to pay. Evidence obtained points to a well organized and widespread Communist scheme to extort funds under the guise of mellowing conditions behind the Iron Curtain. This matter will be followed up by further investigation and inquiry by the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality of the House Judiciary Committee.

APPENDIX

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN BEFORE THE ICEM COUNCIL SESSION

(October 17, 1963)

Mr. Chairman, I welcome this opportunity to offer some preliminary observations on the work of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration.

My interest in the plight of refugees and the problems of surplus populations in Europe goes back to World War II and its immediate aftermath. Looking back over that eventful span of almost 20 years I believe it is fair to say that civilized mankind has made noteworthy progress in meeting the human challenges of this age of conflict. The perplexing social and economic problems which confronted liberated Western Europe have been largely alleviated. In a sense the driving power and spirit of urgency produced by those first years of crisis have diminished, but this does not suggest there are no urgent tasks still before us or that the driving power to accomplish those tasks is not inherent in our common cause. We should take account of the fact that mutual cooperation demanded by the mutual sharing of responsibilities has given us added confidence, know-how, and organization to meet common problems.

As I see it, ICEM is a child of that process. But having passed through periods of test and growth it is now time for your Committee to make a realistic assessment of what the future holds in the field of migration, bearing in mind the existing needs for its established services, the great opportunities for well-organized land settlement programs in the Western Hemisphere, the on-going programs with receiving countries, and the practical requirements of the refugee work.

During the course of the Executive Committee sessions, there was considerable comment and interchange of ideas on the need for ICEM to justify its existence. In all candor, I sensed an effort was being made to justify an expansion of the Committee work into new and unrelated business rather than to justify the existence of the Committee. I do not believe it is necessary for ICEM to justify its existence. This organization has proved both its need and its worth in the past. Moreover, the unfinished business of this organization, clearly within the mandate of the constitution, makes the question of continuation untimely.

On the subject of justification, there is now and there will remain a continuing need for ICEM administration to justify its leadership in terms of priority tasks to be undertaken, initiative exercised in developing selective immigration projects, budget requirements and expenditures in support thereof, including staff requirements in relation to current volume of migrant movements. This is a basic responsibility of all organizations financed with public funds. As the

Director has so well stated, it is the right of every member government to know how the funds of the organization are used.

Turning to the unfinished business of ICEM, several areas of work are, in my opinion, self-evident.

First, refugees in Europe have been a primary concern since the inception of this intergovernmental action at Brussels. A real service has been performed in finding resettlement opportunities in many nations of the free world for these victims of totalitarian oppression. While the volume of refugees entering the countries of first asylum in free Europe has decreased somewhat in recent years, it is impossible to forecast political revolts behind the Russian Iron Curtain which would require emergency action by the Committee. The memory of the Hungarian freedom revolution of 1956 may well portend events yet to unfold. Accordingly, the basic mechanisms for concerted intergovernmental action must be maintained in a reasonable state of readiness, permitting rapid and orderly expansion as the need requires.

Second, similarly, European national migrants have been a primary concern of this Committee since its inception. Here again a real service has been performed in finding and developing settlement opportunities for surplus populations of Europe. Population pressures in Europe have to a large extent been alleviated in the past few years by the economic boom which now blesses much of Europe. The inter-European movement of labor has made it possible for much of Europe to share in this prosperity. While all of us hope this happy trend will continue it is impossible to forecast reverses and interruptions in economic development which will create an increased demand for national migrant movements from Europe to a wide base of receiving countries.

Third, taking into account the reduced number of refugees in Europe and the decrease of economic pressures for national migrant movements from Europe, together with the needs of the receiving countries, it is natural that ICEM should now be concentrating on selective immigration plans and movements. The centers established and now being planned for the specialized training of European migrants to fit the needs of receiving countries is an equally natural outcome of these developments. Experience has taught us that poorly planned migration programs invite failure and disappointments for all involved. The current demand for national migrant movements suggests that ICEM should concentrate further on quality movements of migrants, properly coordinated with the needs of the receiving countries.

These three areas of unfinished business, which I have outlined very briefly, comprise adequate reason for ICEM existence—if reason is required at this session of the Committee.

Beyond these fundamental considerations and clearly within the mandate of the constitution, is the challenge of land development and settlement programs in the underdeveloped countries of the Western Hemisphere. European migrants with selective training, when placed in well-thought-out development programs, can make a substantial contribution to the economic development and general progress of many nations in Latin America. While advancing the welfare of European migrants, such programs can advance the welfare of even greater numbers of nationals in the receiving countries through mixed

group development programs. The transfer of skills and know-how from European migrants to nationals in the receiving countries which can be accomplished through well-organized planning and follow-through would, in my opinion, fill one of the most pressing needs in the developing countries of Latin America.

It is worth noting in this connection that in Latin America, with a few noted exceptions, there is an abundance of productive land, yet many of the countries there are required to import food to meet the needs of their people. This drains off and dissipates foreign exchange credits which should be going into national economic development. Added to this is a population trend in many of the countries in that region from the rural areas to the cities and metropolitan centers. The longrun effects of those trends are all too clear.

Worldwide population trends when compared with the present food-producing capacity of the free world rings a warning signal indicating that priority attention should be directed at the development of new food-producing sources. American agricultural surpluses, resulting from the planned use of technological knowledge, have played the role of a modern-day Samaritan for many parts of the world. But to expect an indefinite continuation of this emergency balance on the scale of human needs does not conform with reality. Human needs will soon outrun our present food production capacities if current population trends continue.

It is, therefore, clear that ways must be found to increase food production throughout the free world. Latin America with its vast land areas awaiting cultivation offers great promise for the future. This means moving to those lands people who are trained in the skills of food production and the companion skills necessary for a good and full life. This also means a willingness on the part of countries in that area of the world to face up to their natural potential. It also means a willingness on the part of third party nations to make financial contributions, commensurate with their abilities, to land development and utilization projects in the developing countries of Latin America.

I am not authorized to speak for the Government of the United States on this question, but I believe the message of President Kennedy to this Council session expressed adequately my Government's intention. I would only add that I am prepared to support in the Congress of the United States proposals that will harness the needs of European migration with the needs of the developing nations of Latin America.

Migrant settlement programs in Latin America have met with failures as well as successes. By a careful examination of the reasons for failure as well as success in these enterprises we can find the keys to greater success in the future. In this process we might well look to the experience, techniques, and know-how demonstrated in the Australian migrant development programs. The able spokesman for that member government has underscored the values of selective immigration in the context of the needs and plans of his country. These same values can be supplied to the developing nations of the Western Hemisphere.

ICEM administration can find no greater challenge to its future than the opportunities for needed services in the developing countries of Latin America. While helping the nations in that area to attain their natural potential, such action programs will contribute immeasurably to the common good of the free world community.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that while noteworthy progress has been made in attaining the common objectives laid down at the Brussels Conference in 1951 there is an urgent need to complete the unfinished business of ICEM.

I appreciate the opportunity afforded me to share these preliminary observations with the delegations of the member governments of ICEM.

INDEX OF FINANCIAL TABLES

*Average transport costs and other costs for voluntary agencies movements in 1962
(expressed in U.S. dollars)*

	Transport costs ¹	Previsa and postvisa services	Administration costs	Total
To Australia:				
From—Austria.....	332	10	51	393
Germany.....	370	10	57	437
Greece.....	315	10	49	374
Italy.....	306	10	47	363
Spain.....	318	10	49	377
Others.....	337	10	52	399
To Canada:				
From—Austria.....	200	10	31	241
Germany.....	171	10	27	208
Greece.....	233	10	35	278
Italy.....	193	10	30	233
Others.....	164	10	26	200
To United States:				
From—Austria.....	96	10	16	122
Germany.....	95	10	16	121
Greece.....	230	10	36	276
Italy.....	121	10	20	151
Spain.....	117	10	19	146
Others.....	118	10	19	147
To Latin America:				
From—Greece.....	243	10	38	291
Italy.....	180	10	27	217
Spain.....	124	10	20	154
Others.....	191	10	30	231

¹ This amount was reimbursed by the voluntary agencies to ICEM.

Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration—Details of grants paid to the voluntary agencies in 1962

[Expressed in U.S. dollars]

European program	Total grants for 1962 (1)	Operational grants to revolving fund (2)	Service grants for administration (3)	Reception and placement grants (4)	Grants for special programs (5)
United HIAS Service.....	177,280	101,480	46,850	29,000	-----
Entr'Aide Ouvriere International.....	1,130	105	25	1,000	-----
International Catholic Migration Committee.....	438,650	250,425	107,925	80,300	-----
International Rescue Committee.....	89,530	50,855	36,175	2,500	-----
International Social Service/Swiss Aid to Europe.....	14,470	3,045	1,925	9,500	-----
Lutheran World Federation.....	12,050	3,500	8,550	-----	-----
National Catholic Welfare Conference.....	276,080	194,880	72,350	-----	8,850
Tolstoy Foundation.....	900	560	400	-----	-----
United Ukrainian American Relief Committee.....	2,160	1,260	900	-----	-----
World Council of Churches.....	868,820	592,970	159,550	52,200	64,100
Council of Voluntary Agencies.....	2,000	-----	-----	2,000	-----
Christian Reformed Resettlement Service Committee.....	275	-----	-----	-----	275
Total.....	1,883,405	1,199,030	434,650	176,500	73,225

Far East and miscellaneous movements programs	Total	Far East	Miscellaneous movements
United HIAS Service.....	1,580	1,280	300
International Catholic Migration Committee.....	240	-----	240
National Catholic Welfare Conference.....	3,680	320	3,360
World Council of Churches.....	33,350	31,820	1,530
Total.....	38,850	34,420	5,430

NOTE.—In addition the agencies receive 10 percent of all repayments to the revolving fund to cover collection expenses.

U.S. escapee program—Grants to voluntary agencies for the period Jan. 1, 1962, through Dec. 31, 1962

Agency	Amount
National Catholic Welfare Conference.....	\$220,530.34
World Council of Churches.....	216,803.05
Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society.....	97,277.12
American Friends of Russian Freedom.....	86,905.58
Tolstoy Foundation.....	83,699.63
International Rescue Committee.....	68,654.69
Polish American Immigration and Relief Committee.....	53,185.85
Administration for International Aid.....	51,205.18
American Fund for Czecho-Slovak Refugees.....	37,076.17
American Joint Distribution Committee.....	24,940.90
Lutheran World Federation.....	6,454.37
ORT.....	6,131.58
YMCA.....	5,739.34
Jamiat al Islam.....	5,570.29
United Ukrainian American Relief Committee.....	3,878.26
Total.....	968,052.35

ICEM and USEP grants to voluntary agencies for 1962

Agency	ICEM	USEP	Total
World Council of Churches.....	\$902,170	\$216,803.05	\$1,118,973.05
National Catholic Welfare Conference.....	279,760	220,530.34	500,290.34
International Catholic Migration Committee.....	438,890		438,890.00
Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society.....	178,860	97,277.12	276,137.12
International Rescue Committee.....	89,530	68,654.69	158,184.69
American Friends of Russian Freedom.....		86,905.58	86,905.58
Tolstoy Foundation.....	960	83,699.63	84,659.63
Polish American Immigration and Relief Committee.....		53,185.85	53,185.85
Administration for International Aid.....	1,130	51,205.18	52,335.18
American Fund for Czechoslovak Refugees.....		37,076.17	37,076.17
American Joint Distribution Committee.....		24,940.90	24,940.90
Lutheran World Federation.....	12,060	6,454.37	18,504.37
International Social Service-Swiss Aid to Europe.....	14,470		14,470.00
ORT.....		6,131.58	6,131.58
United Ukrainian American Relief Committee.....	2,160	3,878.26	6,038.26
YMCA.....		5,739.34	5,739.34
Jamiat al Islam.....	2,000	5,570.29	7,570.29
Council of Voluntary Agencies.....	275		275.00
Christian Reformed Resettlement Service Committee.....			
Total.....	1,922,255	968,052.35	2,890,307.35

○